DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 533 PS 004 230

TITLE	Developmental Day Care Services for Children. 1970 White House Conference on Children, Report of Forum 17. (Working Copy).
INSTITUTION	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	33p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Certification, *Child Care, Child Care Workers, *Child Development, Childhood Needs, *Day Care Programs, *Day Care Services

ABSTRACT

When properly funded and provided with adequate educational, health, and other needed resources, day care programs can make an important contribution to the life of many American families. For a variety of reasons, present services for providing supplementary child care are insufficient. To respond to the changes in our national life style, we must develop a network of supplementary child care facilities readily available to all families with children flexible enough to be part of a family's life, and good enough to promote full development of our nation's children. As a start toward such a system, this forum recommends establishing and allocating the total of financial commitment needed for day care, developing a preventive approach to children's needs and problems, mobilizing continuing public support for day care, and coordinating operational procedures at federal, state, and local levels. (WY)

ED046533

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION)

EMBARGO
NOT FOR RELEASE UNTIL 12 NOON
DECEMBER 8, 1970

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DEVELOPMENTAL DAY CARE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN

Report of Forum 17

1970 White House Conference on Children

PS004230

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION.)

SUMMARY

There is a vast, rapidly growing, and unmet need in America for supplementary child care. Many factors contribute to this situation, including rising employment of mothers, family mobility, urbanization, mobilization to fight poverty, changing patterns of family life, and a greater understanding of the developmental needs of young children.

The present services are insufficient -- partly because the need has grown so rapidly, and partly because much of the new need is different in kind from the older (but still existing) one which aimed only at care for the unusual child or the child from a family with unusual problems. In addition, existing services are too often grossly inadequate in the care they offer. This is usually the result of inadequate funding, insufficiently trained workers, and an incomplete understanding of the supplementary child care needs of the community.

When properly funded, and with adequate educational, health, and other resources, day care programs can not only make an important contribution to the life of many -- perhaps most -- American families, but can also be an extremely potent force in promoting sound growth and development in children. Only recently has widespread recognition been given to the physical, social, and intellectual benefits that can accrue from a variety of programs to serve all children.

We must, as a nation, respond to the changes that we as individuals are living. We must develop a network of supplementary

child care readily available by choice to all families with children; a system flexible enough to be part of family life, and good enough to promote the full development of our nation's children.

As a start toward such a system and toward meeting the acute needs and problems of developmental child care, we recommend:

1. Establishing and allocating the total level of financial commitment needed for day care.
2. Developing a preventive approach to children's needs and problems.
3. Mobilizing continuing public support for day care.
4. Coordinating operation procedures at federal, state, and local levels.

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION.)

CURRENT STATUS

Although Americans believe that we cherish our children, in many ways we are a child-ignoring society which has failed to commit itself to promoting our most valuable resource -- our future generations. It is time to reorder our national priorities in favor of our children. We must prevent the tragedy of wasted human potential and its cumulative financial drain by investing in our children while there is time -- while they are developing the foundations of abilities and attitudes which will determine their lives and the life of this country. We must ensure that each American receives, from birth, the care and the opportunities which are conducive to his fullest development.

The fundamental question is how we can arrange for the optimal nurturance of today's children at a time of profound change in the American family and its living conditions. A variety of part-time child care arrangements outside the family are responding to the changing needs of children, families, and communities. Too many of these ideas and experiments are isolated from each other and from existing community resources. Too often, thought about such programs is fragmented into restricted concepts -- nursery schools, babysitting, preschool enrichment centers, or child care service for parents in job training. These programs should be viewed not as solutions, but as individual responses to parts of a general and growing national need for supplementary child care services.

This paper considers this broad range of needs. It focuses on developmental day care which we define as any supplemental care, supervision, and developmental opportunity for children which augments parental care and guidance. The responsibility for such supplementary care is delegated by parents and generally provided in their absence; however, the parents retain the primary responsibility for rearing their children.

Developmental day care should meet not only normal supervisory, physical, health, and safety needs, but should also provide for the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical growth and development of the child with opportunities for parental involvement and participation. Day care can be provided in day care centers, Head Start programs, nursery schools, day nurseries, kindergartens , and family day care homes as well as before and after school and during vacations. If the traditional school day is extended slightly and the range of activities increased, public and private schools can also provide such care.

Day care is a service for infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and school-age children. Regardless of the hours, the auspices, the funding source, the name of the service, or the child's age, the program should be judged by its success in helping each child develop tools for learning and growing, both in relation to his own life style and abilities and in the context of the larger culture of which he is a member.

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION.)

The Need: Some Data

Many forces are converging to accelerate the need for day care: female employment; family mobility; urbanization; community mobilization to fight poverty; the rise in single-parent families through divorce, separation, or other causes; pressures to reduce the public welfare burden; and realization of the needs and opportunities for early education in the broadest sense. Perhaps the most direct force is the growing number of employed women. Since the beginning of World War II working mothers have increased almost eightfold.[1] Today half of the nation's mothers with school-age children are working at least part time (a third with children under six years),[2] and by the 1980 White House Conference on Children, working mothers of preschool children alone are expected to increase by over one and one-half million.[3] Although the primary motive for women to work is economic -- to provide or help provide food, housing, medical care, and education for their families[4] -- increasing numbers of women work for the personal satisfactions of using their education, skills, and creativity. Many more women, often those with critically needed skills, such as nurses, would work if they could be sure of adequate care for their children.[5] More women are demanding more choices in their lives: choices in parenthood, in jobs, and in family roles. The result -- more than twelve million children under fourteen had mothers working at least part time in 1965; four and one-half million of these children were under six.

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION.)

What happened to those children while their mothers worked? Thirteen percent had mothers who worked only while they were in school, requiring no supplementary care. For the remaining 87 percent, a variety of arrangements were used. Forty-six percent were cared for at home by the father, another adult relative, a sibling (often a child himself), or someone paid to come into the home. Fifteen percent were cared for by their mothers on the job, possibly penalizing the child, the mother, and the employer, and 16 percent were cared for away from home, half by a relative and half in small "family day care homes." Only two percent of the children received group care in a day care center or nursery school, and eight percent received no care at all (including 18,000 preschoolers).[6] These percentages vary, of course, for the different age groups. The complete picture of supplementary care must also include the hundreds of thousands of children attending nursery school whose mothers do not work.[7]

If all these care arrangements were adequate, we would only have to worry about the almost one million "latch-key" children who received no care. But much of the care given does not even assure immediate physical safety, as child accident rates show. We know very little of the quality of care given by non-maternal sources in the home, but of the outside arrangements, far too many are unlicensed, unsupervised, and chosen because they are the only available care alternative. Presently about 640,000 spaces exist for children in licensed day care centers

and family homes, compared to the estimated need for several million.[8] And even those many dedicated women who put effort and love into their "family care" or nursery school often lack the training and the educational, medical, physical, and financial resources to meet the needs of a growing child. In a study of New York City, 80 percent of the known and inspected day care homes were rated as inadequate.[9] Since the major failings were related to inadequate financial resources and physical facilities, and since the homes were in the child's neighborhood, it is reasonable to assume that other neighborhood home care sites, including the child's own home, would rate no better using the same criteria.

The dramatic rise in the need for day care services caused by changing employment patterns has partly overshadowed the great needs evident since well before the first White House Conference on Children in 1910. Special programs are required to serve the needs of children suffering emotional disturbance, mental retardation, cerebral palsy, and other physical handicaps; to assist families with such children by relieving the parents of some of the burdens of full-time care; and to help strengthen families in difficult situations by offering child care and attention perhaps otherwise unobtainable. These needs still exist, and in large numbers. Over 11 percent of school-age children have emotional problems requiring some type of mental health service.[10] But the vast majority of these five million children and preschoolers with similar problems can be treated by trained professionals and paraprofessionals "working

PS 004230

in settings not primarily established for treatment of mental illness."[11] Three million persons under the age of 20 are mentally retarded and most could learn to care largely for themselves, with adequate training and continued support, but special education classes reach only a quarter of those needing them.[12] Similarly, of the thousands of families with children handicapped by blindness, cerebral palsy, and other disorders, many are unable to find the necessary assistance in caring for their children. Partly in response to these facts, the recent Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children recommended the "creation or enlargement of day care and preschool programs" as a major preventive service, with an important potential role in crisis intervention and treatment services.[13] These programs, they said, should be "available as a public utility to all children."[14]

Previous Answers

The response by the social institutions traditionally responsible for child care has often been to treat the new needs simply as more of the old. For decades, "day care" has been part of "child welfare," where it has been "tended by a devoted few, condescended to by many." It is still widely believed that only mothers on the verge of destitution would seek employment and outside care for their children; that only disintegrating families, where the parents were unfit to give even minimal care, would seek outside support. The need for day care is often viewed as the result of other pathology in

the family, its use justified only in forestalling greater disaster for the child.[15]

The child welfare concept of day care -- as a service to poor and problem families -- contributed to resistance to enlarging the services to cover broader segments of the population. Inadequately funded and primarily concerned with the care and protection of children, agencies usually responded by creating supervised centers for care, and/or promoting additional regulation and licensing of less formal child care arrangements. Both approaches have failed to meet the current demand for day care arrangements. Although thousands of families are unable to find care for their children, some group care centers show serious under-enrollment; one study found that nearly three-quarters of the centers in one city had spaces available.[16] Yet the same study found only 250 officially approved and licensed day care homes serving the community, compared to several thousand women providing care in informal and unregulated arrangements.

The reasons that the traditional responses have touched only a minor part of the present supplementary child care needs are complex, but include lack of community coordination and information on available programs, the high cost of center care, and parental preference for convenient and personal arrangements. This points to a need for sponsoring agencies to be flexible and responsive to family needs; agencies must encourage families to

understand and seek quality care. The needs and uses of child care services have changed more rapidly than our understanding of the situation and our ability to respond to it.

The point is that supplementary child care is no longer needed primarily to buttress disintegrating families. Economics, divorce, education, and other factors have led to a variety of family situations. The working mother is no longer a "misfit," and the family is not the simple mother-father-child picture usually assumed and expected. By the end of this decade, it is possible that most children will have working mothers, and there is no reason to think these mothers will be less concerned than other mothers about the care their children receive, or that their employment will, of itself, lead to destructive deviations from normal parent-child relationships.[17]

Because the primary need for day care is to help functioning families lead more satisfying lives, and not to replace families, services which are not responsive to the variety of family needs will not be adequate. We must understand the process by which families choose a particular child care arrangement. In general, they are looking for supplementary care that is flexible in hours, reasonable in cost, convenient in location, and, often last, dependable in quality.[18] The challenge we face is to develop a system of services with at least two effects: making parents more aware of quality in child care programs; and delivering good care to all children, regardless of the specific arrangement.

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION.)

A New Force: Child Development

A second force in the increasing demand for supplementary child care available to all citizens grows out of recent discoveries on the importance of early experience on human growth and development. Psychologists, pediatricians, psychiatrists, educators, nutritionists, anthropologists, and other investigators continue to document the critical significance of the first years of life. The central finding is that during the years when a child's body, intellect, and psyche are developing most rapidly, his conditions of life will profoundly influence his later health, motivations, intelligence, self-image, and relations to other people.[19] The influences can be supportive or destructive: the President's Commission on Mental Retardation estimated that three-quarters of mental retardation in America could not be related directly to genetics, physical damage, or other organic factors, and was typically associated with very low income areas.[20] In such areas early health care, nutrition, and developmental opportunities are often minimal. Every moment of a child's life is learning -- what he can and cannot do, what adults expect and think of him, what people need and like and hate, what his role in society will be. His best chances for a satisfying and constructive adulthood grow from a satisfying and constructive childhood and infancy. Sound development cannot be promoted too early.

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION.)

One reason for past resistance by many social institutions to extra-familial child care was their deep belief in the importance of family life and fear of the possibly destructive results of separating a child from its mother. The institutional syndrome of maternal deprivation found in many orphanages was assumed to be attributable to any separation from the biological mother, rather than to prolonged separation combined with other institutional conditions, such as perceptual monotony; little interaction with adults; lack of a basis for self, family, and historical identity. Traditional guidelines viewed day care as a last resort because these findings were overgeneralized to include the part-time -- and very different -- separation involved in day care, where the child returns daily to the family.[21]

While it remains supremely important to ensure against deprivation of adult care, it now appears that with adequate planning even full day care for infants can sustain emotional adjustment and leave intact attachment to the mother.[22] In addition, it is becoming clear that day care holds an important potential for providing all children with "the essentials of experience" which support optimal development. Although few attempts were made until recently to evaluate objectively the effects of full day care, abundant research documents the possibility of desirable effects associated with one or another variety of experience outside the home which involves careful planning of the environment for the young child.[23] New research is accumulating to demonstrate

that day care projects can provide programs highly beneficial to the social and intellectual functioning of children.[24] When programs are successfully integrated with, and followed up by, the public school system, the possibility of maintaining these advantages remains high.

It is also important to realize that the place where care is given is not the most significant dimension for a child. The issue is the kind of care given: how he is handled, what abilities are nurtured, what values are learned, what attitudes toward people are acquired. The child can learn to trust or hate in a neighbor's apartment, a commune, an expensive nursery school, or in his own house. Parents have realized this, and their fear of exposing their children to destructive influences, along with a widespread misunderstanding of children's needs and their relationship to our particular nuclear family arrangement, have tied "women more tightly to their children than has been thought necessary since the invention of bottle feeding and baby carriages."[25]

Our traditional model of the biological mother as the sole and constant caretaker is, in fact, unusual. In most cultures and in most centuries, care has been divided among the mother, father, sisters, brothers, aunts, grandparents, cousins, and neighbors. Universal education for older children, the geographic mobility of families, and the social isolation of many people in the cities have drastically limited these resources for the American mother. As a result, we are now creating a situation

in which the child is given for a substantial part of his day to a person who initially has no close social relationship with the family. But this, like the location of care, may be of little importance by itself -- it is the quality of the care, whatever its source, which is the world of the child and which influences the future adult.

Day care is a powerful institution. Quality service geared to the needs and abilities of each child can be an enormously constructive influence. But a poorly funded program, where children are left with few challenging activities and have little relationship with or guidance from adults, can seriously jeopardize development. A day care program that ministers to a child from six months to six years of age has over 8,000 hours to teach him values, fears, beliefs, and behaviors. Therefore, the question of what kinds of people we want our children to become must guide our view of day care. Scientific knowledge can point to several possible dangers and can suggest principles for sound programs. But the program which best suits a particular child of a particular family in a particular community cannot be predicted in any precise way. After all standards and guidelines have been met and each program has been made as good as possible, parents and organizations must still remain open and responsible for meeting the needs of individual children.

Day care programs cannot hope to meet the needs of children unless they are responsive to parents' values and their understanding of their own children. Similarly, parents can learn

a great deal about meeting the needs of their children by remaining open to new knowledge about child development. One of the socially beneficial aspects of a day care program is that it provides a forum for parents and staff to jointly pursue new understandings to guide child-rearing endeavors.

Day Care, Politics, and Reality

A third factor behind the growing demand for day care is simply pragmatic. A growing number of mothers want to work and will seek the benefits of good care for their children and for themselves. Many parents will prefer not to use outside child care. Mothers should have the freedom to choose whether to stay home full time to rear their children or whether to work without penalizing their children. In addition, such programs as Head Start have made the public aware of the vast potentials which can be realized if we commit ourselves and our country to providing a sufficient number of quality programs which encourage a new vigor for life in children, families, and communities. Given a taste of such programs, the public is becoming anxious for continuation and expansion. To discuss at length whether day care is an economic luxury, a political right, or a social tool ignores the tremendous need for supplementary care which exists today, a need which parents will continue to meet the best they can with whatever resources are available. The question is not whether America "should" have day care, but rather whether the day care which we do have, and will have, will be good -- for the child, for the family, and for the nation.

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION.)

As with any question of economic and social resources, people with the least private access to them deserve primary consideration in the allocation of public resources. But to focus only on the poor, in this case, distorts the picture. Despite the fact that employment rates are higher for mothers who are the sole support of their children, and higher for those whose husbands earn less than $3,000 a year, most working mothers have working husbands earning more than $5,000 a year. Mothers with the most education are seeking jobs and child care at the highest rate.[26] But even middle-class affluence does not guarantee that adequate care can be purchased; adequate care can cost over $2,000 per year, per child.[27] The broad problem facing our public and private institutions is one of organizing good services for all families. Piecemeal answers could easily become another force to divide our country on the basis of economics and color.

The Challenge

There are two clear issues in day care for American children: 1) the comprehensiveness and quality of care which all children should receive, regardless of its source; 2) the responsiveness and flexibility of social institutions to the changing needs and desires of American parents. The best care, with stimulating and nurturant personnel, will be wasted if offered in programs which will not be used by families as they adjust their own social, economic, and personal needs. Simply keeping the child during parents' working hours without applying our utmost expertise and common sense for his sound development is as cruel and absurd as

feeding him only the minimal nutrition required to sustain life, and expecting a vigorous and healthy body. We need not just day care centers so mothers can work, nor just preschools. Rather, we, as a nation, must respond to the changes that we as individuals are living, changes in our views of family roles and in the needs of our families with children. We must develop a network of voluntary supplementary child care, flexible enough to be part of family life, able to promote the full development of our children, and readily available to all families with children.

PLANNING SUPPLEMENTARY CHILD CARE SERVICES

Forum 17 believes that the following points should be carefully considered in planning supplementary child care services.

Settings

Although the location of child care is not a crucial factor, different settings can influence how well a particular service fits the needs of a family. For example, a center for children of two to six years adjacent to a factory may be extremely useful to both employees and employers. But such a center would be of little use to an employee mother with younger children who need infant care, or older ones who need after-school supervision. For a mother who works only short hours, the family day care home run by a neighbor, or a home-visiting service operating out of a child care center may be more useful. A truly functional network of child care will offer a variety of services to meet the needs of all families with children of all ages. This will require a flexibility of settings.

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION.)

The lack of funds for renovating and constructing facilities has inhibited the growth of more and innovative services. If a program must be revised to accommodate limitations of the available settings, crucial program elements for the child may be slighted. Every effort, therefore, must be made to provide resources and settings for the services which are most appropriate to a given set of needs.

Personnel

There are not enough trained day care personnel to staff current programs, and expanding the services will increase this shortage. If half the four- and five-year-old children of working mothers were served by programs following the Federal Interagency Standard ratio of one adult to five children, over 35,000 trained personnel would be needed to staff those programs alone. Recent attempts to define the skills needed by these workers have stressed general human abilities and sympathies, and specific training in child development, family relations, and community involvement. The need for persons with a variety of expertise suggests that active cooperation between educational institutions, local businesses, and individuals in the community can be very profitable. Academic training is by no means necessary or desirable for all child care workers, but experience and training are essential for quality care. In-service training of local persons has proven a valuable procedure for many day care programs, serving the joint purpose of producing excellent staff who know the life situation of the children, and of using resources efficiently. Local colleges are often of assistance in helping with planning and running the training programs, and in providing

with planning and running the training programs, and in providing academic credit for those interested and able to develop careers in the field. Such career ladders are an important part of training programs. New roles are also needed for workers, both in terms of the duties they perform and the persons who fill them. Some programs are now being developed for personnel to administer basic health services and other program elements. Teen-agers and older citizens, both male and female, can also work in programs to the benefit of both the staff and the children.

Programs

In the end, the content of child care programs is most important to the development of the child. Children need to learn social and intellectual attitudes and skills that will enable them to cope successfully with society and meet their own individual needs. A good program, then, must attend to all areas of growth: social, physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual. How these elements are combined in the program will depend heavily on such factors as the type of service and the other developmental resources of the community. Several points stand out, however, as especially important.

1. A good program must focus on the development of warm, trusting, and mutually respectful social relationships with adults and other children. Such relationships form the basis not only for the social and personal development of the child, but also for his future ability to learn from others.
2. The program must help develop self-identity so that each child views himself and his background as worthy of

respect and dignity. A child's image of himself as a a member of a racial, cultural, religious, or economic group is basic to a strong self-concept. "Cultural relevance," therefore, is not a separate political issue but an integral part of human development. Day care must not alienate a child from his family and his peers. Those in charge of programs must be knowledgeable of and sensitive to the values and patterns of life in the children's homes. To help correct past inadequacies and injustices and move toward a truly human heritage for future generations, children must be permitted to learn about our diverse cultures and their contributions to modern America.

3. Provisions must be made to ensure optimal nutrition and health care.
4. Attention must be given to the full development of each child, taking into account his or her individual ability, personality, imagination, and independence, and resisting the degradation caused by racist, sexist, economic, cultural, and other stereotypes.
5. A good program should seek the knowledge and resources of those trained in, and familiar with, child development for selection and use of equipment, space, and methods to achieve the desired goals.
6. The inclusion of parents in the affairs of the program is a vital element in the value of the program to the child. Parental participation can be at several levels,

depending on the time and skills of a particular family. The aim is mutually beneficial communication between the program and the parents. Parental control of fundamental aspects of the program is also important; this is one reason informal and private arrangements are preferred by many parents.

In institutionalized group care facilities, especially when supported by public funds, legal issues may become complicated, but they nevertheless remain secondary to the principle that day care centers, like governments, are instituted to serve the people. The power of control must, therefore, ultimately rest with those affected by the programs. Children, whose lives are the most affected, cannot vote for either policy-making bodies or public officials. They must not be forgotten. One concern of day care as an institution should be to act as a voice for children.

Licensing

The licensing of out-of-home care for children can serve the dual purposes of protecting children and their families from inadequate care, and of helping agencies and individuals improve their programs through providing, promoting, or coordinating training for staff in administration, program planning, and daily interaction and understanding of children. Unfortunately, many licensing authorities do not live up to these possibilities because regulations are inappropriate, or because their own training and funding are inadequate. In some cases, the complexity of local, state, and other requirements impedes the establishment

of local, state, and other requirements impedes the establishment and expansion of proframs, both good and bad. Too often, regulations focus on superficial differences in services, such as "nursery schools" versus "day care centers," and ignore other areas, such as the inclusion of specific program elements. The creation of licensing agencies with the resources and power to take strong action against harmful programs and equally strong action for better care is one of the most important challenges in working for a flexible network of quality child care services.

Organization for the Delivery of Services

The need for coordination in the delivery of services arises in every discussion of day care needs. We see the goals as coordination and consolidation at upper levels, with diversity and flexibility at local levels.

Although the federal government is making efforts at coordinated planning through such actions as the Community Coordinated Child Care Program (4C), designed by the Federal Parel on Early Childhood, it is currently operating over 60 different funding programs for child care or child development. Among these, there are at least seven separate programs with funds for operating expenses, nine personnel training programs, seven research programs, four food programs, and three loan programs. Only a few of these, however, are aimed directly at child development. Most were set up for other purposes and day care or child development is only ancillary. Funding, moreover, is grossly inadequate, and state and local support is, with rare exceptions, minimal or non-existent.

This proliferation could result in some cases of child care

centers funded by different sources competing for the same children. In other cases, proposed and needed centers cannot get funded. Lack of coordination may mean frequent placement changes for children. And, ironically, the complexity of sources can result in sorely needed funds remaining unknown and unused.

One solution to this set of problems would be to establish a federal mechanism for consolidation and local structures for coordination and diversity.

At the federal level, consolidation of administrative responsibility for children's programs is urgently needed. The present administration has taken a significant step in establishing the Office of Child Development (OCD), and assigning to it responsibility for day care services. However, designation of the responsibilities for all programs concerned with early childhood development has not yet occurred. Thus, Head Start and other programs could remain within OCD, while day care services delivered as part of the Family Association Plan could operate quite separately from another office. This arrangement would violate both the ethical and scientific arguments against segregating children on the basis of financial need. Furthermore, health, educational, psychological, and social services are all part of the many-faceted approach which quality early childhood programs should include. Developmental and day care services should be consolidated in an arm of the federal government charged with general responsibility for all aspects of child development. Child development programs should focus on the child, not on his parents' status or on a bureaucratic division.

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION.)

At the state and local level, maximum flexibility is needed and is compatible with a democratic form of government. The establishment of a coordinative mechanism of: 1) the several branches of government involved in the provision of day care services, 2) non-public agencies, involved either directly or indirectly, and 3) a substantial number of parents, would provide for diversity of programing and sponsorships which can best meet the needs of each community, parent, and child. Such a coordinative arrangement would serve to share knowledge of funding sources, to process information on the establishment and operation of programs, and to centralize such resources as training and purchasing. A community-wide planning process would determine the priorities of need and funding which would ensure both the continuity of services and the generation of new programs.

The need for supplementary child care services is so great that only by cooperation of all parties can it be met. Estimates of the cost for the immediate unmet needs are on the order of 2-4 billion dollars a year. Only the federal government can mobilize such funds on a coordinated basis; but other sources, public and private, will be vitally needed, in addition, for the forseeable future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the purposes of the White House Conference is to formulate specific proposals for action during the next decade. The

following four areas were identified during the pre-conference forum work as important:

1. The total level of financial commitment needed for day care
2. The mechanism to accomplish the financial goals
3. The mechanism for mobilizing continuing public support for day care
4. Coordination of operating procedures at the federal, state, and local levels.

Suggestions for these topics follow. Additional concerns will be assigned to task forces during the Conference, and will include: training and personnel, facilities and standards, and monitoring.

1. The time has come for America to commit a major portion of its national resources to the nurture of young children. We recommend, therefore, that the President and Congress act through legislation to guarantee the right of every child, parent, and community in the nation, to quality child care services. Federal funds must be invested now in the development of a national network of supplementary child care services which will be locally controlled, publicly supported, and universally available. Federal funding should reach the level of six to ten billion dollars annually by the next White House Conference on Children in 1980. It should include long-term support for operations, training,

construction and renovation of physical facilities, research and demonstration, technical assistance, licensing and monitoring of programs, and the preparation and distribution of information.

2. We propose a beginning national commitment to a preventive approach to children's needs and problems through the establishment of a children's fund, which would have allocated to it by Congress a minimum of $0.50 per child per week. These funds -- an insurance program to assure America's children the opportunity to develop optimally -- would cover a range of preventive services -- day care, Head Start, child development services, and additionally, maternal and child health, prenatal care, parent education, and services to the preadolescent child.

3. We propose that a Presidential task force be created and empowered to broaden public understanding of day care needs and to mobilize continuing support for their fulfillment. Their actions should include an intensive publicity campaign aimed at public, private, and non-profit groups, business and labor, professional associations, community organizations, and other groups, to encourage their collaboration and cooperation. The membership of the task forces should represent the breadth of economic and cultural groups in America who are concerned with the issues of day care. It should prepare a report on

their actions and accomplishments for the next White House Conference.

4. We recommend for America a system of supplementary child care services which: 1) is available to children of all ages from conception through youth, to families from every kind of economic and social background, and to every community, with priorities to those whose need is greatest; 2) is available through a wide variety of different types of programs and during all the hours of the day and time of the year that children, families, and communities need it; 3) has the full range of components required to promote the intellectual, emotional, social, and physical growth of the children it serves; 4) Ensure parents a decisive policy role in the planning, operation, and evaluation of programs which determine the environment in which their children live; 5) places the major responsibility for planning and operating child care and development services at the local level; and 6) reflects and builds on the culture and language of children, families, and communities being served. To accomplish this, consolidation and coordination should be instituted at the federal level leading to coordination and diversity at the local level. At the regional, state, and local levels, cooperative efforts by all relevant legal, health, educational, economic, and social service institutions should have administrative and financial support. When a state's

efforts are unable to meet the needs of its children, direct federal funding to local efforts should be required. At the local level, this structure should result in a variety of coordinated supplementary child care services, including trained persons offering family day care, group home day care, day care centers, home visiting, and homemaker programs. In many cases, we recommend that this be accomplished through neighborhood family development centers, which would serve as focal points for incoming resources and outgoing services to children and their families. All these activities should be supported and monitored through appropriate and adequate standards by a licensing or other agency.

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION.)

REFERENCES

1. Beatrice Rosenberg and Pearl G. Spindler, Day Care Facts, U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, Publication WB-70-213, May 1970, p.1.

2. U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. As presented in Profiles of Children, 1970 White House Conference on Children.

3. Mary Dublin Keyserling, Working Mothers and the Need for Child Care Services, U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, June 1968, pp. 6-7.

4. Seth Low and Pearl G. Spindler, Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States, Children's Bureau Publication no. 461-1968, pp. 8-10.

5. See, for example, Child Care Services Provided by Hospitals, U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, Bulletin 295-1970, p.20.

6. Low and Spindler, op. cit., pp. 15-18.

7. Sixteen percent of all three- and four-year-olds in the United States, or 1.2 million children, now attend some form of educational nursery school, up from 9.6 percent in 1964. The increase is apparently largely the result of the Head Start program. Data from the Census Bureau as reported in the New York Times, 11 October 1970, p. 8.

8. Rosenberg and Spindler, op. cit., p. 2.

9. Milton Willner, The Magnitude and Scope of Family Day Care in New York City, final report of Grant R120 from the Children's Bureau, 1966.

10. Mental Health Services for Children, prepared by the Center for Studies of Child and Family Mental Health, National Institute of Mental Health; Public Health Service publication 1844, October 1968.

11. Crisis in Child Mental Health: Challenge for the 1970's, Report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 38.

12. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and National Institute of Child Health and Development. As presented in Profiles of Children, 1970 White House Conference on Children.

13. Crisis in Mental Health, op. cit., p. 27.

14. Ibid., p. 62.

15. Florence A. Ruderman, "Conceptualizing Needs for Day Care," in Day Care: An Expanding Resource for Children (New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1965), pp. 14-27.

16. Florence A. Ruderman, Child Care and Working Mothers: A Study of Arrangements Made for Daytime Care of Children (New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1968), pp. 88, 338-358.

17. Lois M. Stolz, "Effects of Maternal Employment in Children: Evidence of Research," Child Development 37 (1960):749-782; See also F. I. Nye and Hoffman, The Employed Mother in America (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963).

18. Arthur C. Emlen, Realistic Planning for the Day Care Consumer, mimeograph, 1970.

19. J. McV. Hunt, Intelligence and Experience (New York: Ronald, 1961); Benjamin S. Bloom, Stability and Change in Human Characteristics (New York: Wiley, 1964); Henry W. Maier, Three Theories of Child Development: The Contributions of Erik H. Erikson, Jean Piaget, and Robert Sears, and their Applications (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).

20. PCMR Message. "The Retarded Victims of Deprivation," An Address by Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director, National Urban League, to the 18th Annual Convention of the National Association for Retarded Children, Portland, Oregon, 19 October 1967 (Washington, D. C.: The President's Committee on Mental Retardation, January 1968).

21. Milton Willner, "Day Care; a Reassessment," Child Welfare 44 (1965): 125-133; World Health Organization, Deprivation of Maternal Care: A Reassessment of its Effects (Geneva: WHO, 1962).

22. Bettye M. Caldwell and Lucille E. Smith, "Day Care for the Very Young--Prime Opportunity for Primary Prevention," American Journal of Public Health 60 (1970): 690-697; Bettye M. Caldwell, Charlene M. Wright, Alice S. Honig, and Jordan Tannenbaum, "Infant Day Care and Attachment," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 40 (1970): 397-412.

23. See, for example, Joan W. Swift, "Effects of Early Group Experience: The Nursery School and Day Nursery," in M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman, Review of Child Development Research (New York: Russell Sage, 1964), 1:249-289.

24. Bettye M. Caldwell, "The Supportive Environment Model of Early Enrichment," paper presented at annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Miami, Florida, September 1970; E. S. Schaefer, "Home Tutoring, Maternal Behavior and Infant Intellectual Development," paper presented at the American Psychological Association Meeting, Washington, D. C., September 1969; P. Levenstein, "Cognitive Growth in Preschoolers through Verbal Interaction with Mothers," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 40 (1970): 426-432; Laura L. Dittman (ed.), Early Child Care: The New Perspectives (New York: Atherton, 1968).

25. Margaret Mead, "Some Theoretical Considerations on the Problem of Mother-child Separation," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 24 (1954): 477.

26. Who are the Working Mothers? Leaflet 37 (rev.), U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, May 1970.

27. Estimates of cost of care vary widely, depending on the region of the country and the type of care given. The Office of Child Development has estimated that full day center care ranges from $1245 to $2320 per child per year, for "minimal" to "desirable" care. Similar costs for family day care range from $1423 to $2372 and for before and after school and summer care from $310 to $653. (Standards and Costs for Day Care, mimeograph of Office of Child Development, prepared by J. Sugerman, et al.)

(THIS IS A WORKING COPY - SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION.)

FORUM 17 MEMBERS

Jerome Kagan (Chairman)

Mrs. Richard Lansburgh (Vice Chairman)

Mrs. Paul Boswell

Bettye Caldwell

Luis Diaz De Leon

Donald Fink

Mrs. W. E. Finlayson

Mrs. Almavina Garcia

Oddie Hoover

Ruth E. Jefferson

Hope Lugo

Mary Robinson

Evelyn K. Moore

Jule Sugarman

Mrs. William Barton

Clara Godbouldt

Shirley Patterson (Coordinator)

Nan Galbraith (Coordinator)